

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 15-16, 18-25, 40-41, 43-50, 55-56 and 58-68 are pending in the present application. Claims 15, 16, 18, 23, 24, 40, 41, 43, 48, 49, 55, 56, 58, 63 and 64 were amended, and dependent claims 66-68 were added. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, on page 15, lines 8-15, page 22, line 13 to page 23, line 23. Applicant has carefully considered the cited art and the Examiner's comments in the Final Office Action dated March 14, 2007, and believes the claims currently in the case patentably distinguish over the cited art and are allowable in their present form. Reconsideration is, accordingly, respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner has rejected claims 15, 16, 18-25, 40, 41, 43-50, 55, 56 and 58-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen, U.S. Patent No. 5,875,443. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner states:

Regarding independent claim 15, Nielsen discloses that an organizational database includes dictionaries as organizational units, the dictionaries being hierarchically ordered (column 6, lines 19-47 of Nielsen). Nielsen discloses scanning a data stream and detecting a word that does not match any of the words in a dictionary (column 3, lines 15-50 of Nielsen). Nielsen also discloses that a user may indicate that, regardless of not detecting the word, it is correctly spelled and add it to a dictionary (column 3, lines 30-51 of Nielsen). Nielsen also discloses that a list of dictionaries to be updated with the new term is provided (column 6, line 64-column 7, line 12 of Nielsen). Nielsen discloses that a database contains multiple dictionaries that are broken down into organizational units (column 3, line 30- column 4, line 11 of Nielsen). The determination of which dictionaries to update on the server is determined based on these organizational units (column 3, line 30-column 4, line 11 of Nielsen)

Final Office Action dated March 14, 2007, pages 2-3.

Claim 15 as amended herein is as follows:

15. A method for updating a plurality of dictionaries or glossaries stored within a data processing system, wherein the data processing system includes an organizational database comprising information regarding a structure of an organization, wherein each dictionary or glossary of the plurality of dictionaries or glossaries is a member of a hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries, and wherein each dictionary or glossary in the hierarchical set of dictionaries or glossaries is associated with a respective organizational unit within the structure of the organization, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

automatically scanning a datastream;

automatically detecting, in the datastream, a word that does not match an indexed term or word in a dictionary or a glossary of the plurality of dictionaries or glossaries; and responsive to an indication that the unmatched word is a properly spelled new term, determining, with reference to the organizational database, a list of organizational units which utilize the new term, and a list of associated dictionaries and/or glossaries in the hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries to be updated with the new term.

A prior art reference anticipates a claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of the claimed invention is identically shown in that single prior art reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). All limitations of a claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Applicant respectfully submits that Nielsen does not identically show every element of the claimed invention arranged as they are in the claims; and, accordingly, does not anticipate the claims. With respect to claim 1, in particular, Nielsen does not teach or suggest a data processing system that includes “an organizational database comprising information regarding a structure of an organization, wherein each dictionary or glossary of the plurality of dictionaries or glossaries is a member of a hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries, and wherein each dictionary or glossary in the hierarchical set of dictionaries or glossaries is associated with a respective organizational unit within the structure of the organization”; and, in addition, does not teach or suggest “responsive to an indication that the unmatched word is a properly spelled new term, determining, with reference to the organizational database, a list of organizational units which utilize the new term, and a list of associated dictionaries and/or glossaries in the hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries to be updated with the new term.”

In Nielsen, when a user determines that a new entry should be added to his local dictionary, he is given the opportunity to request addition of the entry also to the vendor's global approved dictionaries, of which there is one for each language supported by the vendor. In Nielsen, each vendor dictionary is for a vendor supported language. Nielsen does not disclose or suggest a data processing system that includes “an organizational database comprising information regarding a structure of an organization, wherein each dictionary or glossary of the plurality of dictionaries or glossaries is a member of a hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries, wherein each dictionary or glossary in the hierarchical set of dictionaries or glossaries is associated with a respective organizational unit within the structure of the organization” as now recited in claim 15. Nielsen does not disclose or suggest an organizational database

comprising information regarding a structure of an organization, and does not disclose or suggest that each dictionary or glossary in the hierarchical set of dictionaries or glossaries is associated with a respective organizational unit within the structure of the organization.

On page 5 of the Final Office Action dated March 14, 2007; the Examiner stated that Nielsen was considered to disclose hierarchically ordered dictionaries because Nielsen discloses the main dictionary supplied by the vendor and any supplemental dictionaries customized by the user. Even if these dictionaries could be construed as being hierarchically ordered, clearly they are not a member of a hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries wherein “each dictionary or glossary in the hierarchical set of dictionaries or glossaries is associated with a respective organizational unit within the structure of the organization.”

Nielsen also does not disclose “responsive to an indication that the unmatched word is a properly spelled new term, determining, with reference to the organizational database, a list of organizational units which utilize the new term, and a list of associated dictionaries and/or glossaries in the hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries to be updated with the new term” as now recited in claim 15. Nielsen does not determine with reference to an organizational database, a list of organizational units which utilize a new term, and a list of associated dictionaries and/or glossaries in the hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries to be updated with the new term.

Claim 15, accordingly, is not anticipated by Nielsen and patentably distinguishes over Nielsen in its present form.

Claims 16 and 18-25 depend from and further restrict claim 15, and are also not anticipated by Nielsen, at least by virtue of their dependency.

Independent claims 40 and 55 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 15 and are not anticipated by Nielsen for similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 15. Claims 41, 43-50, 56 and 58-65 depend from and further restrict one of claims 40 and 55 and are also not anticipated by Nielsen.

New claims 66-68 depend from claims 15, 40 and 55, respectively, and recite the structure of the organization in greater detail. These claims patentably distinguish over Nielsen in their own right as well as by virtue of their dependency.

II. Conclusion

For at least all the above reasons, it is respectfully urged that claims 15-16, 18-25, 40-41, 43-50, 55-56 and 58-68 are patentable over Nielsen and that this application is now in condition for allowance. It is, accordingly, respectfully requested that the Examiner so find and issue a Notice of Allowance in due course.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: May 1, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Gerald H. Glanzman/
Gerald H. Glanzman
Reg. No. 25,035
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants